	Conter	ence
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	V.	19 Cr. 832 (ER)
5	LUIS MERCED, WILLIAM SKINNER,	
6	DORIAN BROOKS,	
7	Defendants.	
8	x	
9		December 10, 2019 10:10 a.m.
.0		
.1	Before:	
.2	HON. EDGA	RDO RAMOS,
.3		District Judge
. 4		
.5		
.6		
.7		
.8		
:0		
21		
22		
:3		
:4		
25		

JCA5merC conference 1 APPEARANCES GEOFFREY S. BERMAN 2 United States Attorney for the 3 Southern District of New York BY: ANDREW K. CHAN Assistant United States Attorney 4 5 MIEDEL & MYSLIWIEC Attorneys for Defendant Merced 6 BY: AARON MYSLIWIEC 7 LAW OFFICE OF GEORGE R. GOLTZER Attorneys for Defendant Skinner 8 BY: GEORGE R. GOLTZER 9 LAW OFFICE OF MARK S. DeMARCO Attorneys for Defendant Brooks BY: MARK S. DeMARCO 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

2

3 the

4

5

6

•

7

9

10

1112

13

15

14

16

1718

19

2021

22

2324

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your name for the record.

MR. CHAN: Good morning, your Honor. Andrew Chan here on behalf of the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. MYSLIWIEC: Good morning, your Honor. Aaron Mysliwiec here on behalf of Mr. Merced.

MR. GOLTZER: Good morning, your Honor. George Goltzer for Mr. Skinner.

MR. DeMARCO: And Mark DeMarco for Mr. Brooks. Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning to you all. This matter is on for initial conference so, Mr. Chan, beginning with you, why don't you tell me a little bit about the case.

MR. CHAN: Your Honor, all three defendants are charged with one count of murder in furtherance of drug trafficking in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 848(e), and Title 18 United States Code Section 2. These charges relate to the participation of the defendants in a murder that took place on February 10, 1989. On that date, in the Bedford Stuyvesant neighborhood of Brooklyn these men participated in the murder of an individual named Efren Cardenas, who was shot over 20 times. The evidence at trial will show that these three defendants participated in the

murder as part of their involvement in a drug trafficking organization that was distributing large kilogram quantities of powder cocaine and crack cocaine in the New York City metropolitan area as well as the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

An indictment was filed on November 19th, and

Defendants Merced and Skinner were arrested on November 20th

and arrested and presented in magistrate court. On December 6,

Dorian Brooks was transferred from state custody to federal

custody and was also presented in magistrate's court.

Can I provide an update regarding discovery?

THE COURT: Please.

First of all, tell me what discovery is.

MR. CHAN: The discovery in this case is primarily consisting of law enforcement records, an autopsy report, some photographs, some phone records, excerpts from some witness interview reports, and a trial transcript from defendant William Skinner's trial relating to this murder in Brooklyn County Supreme Court back in October of you 1990. Unlike many of our other cases, the discovery in this case is not particularly voluminous. There is not much of any electronic discovery to be produced and so I think that it should not take very long for the defendants to review the discovery. We already entered a protective order for the Court's consideration on behalf of defendants Merced and Skinner, which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Court signed, and discovery was produced to them on November 27. I believe on Friday I filed a motion to the Court requesting for a modification of the prospective or to also cover Defendant Brooks, and the discovery was given to Brooks' attorney before the conference this morning.

THE COURT: Is that protective order on consent?

MR. GOLTZER: Yes.

MR. MYSLIWIEC: Yes.

MR. DeMARCO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, discovery is complete from the government's perspective, Mr. Chan?

MR. CHAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't you tell me about that 1990 state trial.

> MR. CHAN: Yes, your Honor.

Defendant William Skinner was arrested by the New York City Police Department in connection with this murder of Efren Cardenas. His case, and his case alone, the other two defendants in this case were not arrested and were not charged in Brooklyn Supreme Court. Mr. Skinner was. He proceeded to trial in October of 1990. My understanding, based on the Court records, is that he was acquitted of the murder charge and then he was convicted of a criminal possession of a weapon charge in the second degree. That case then went to the Appellate Division and, on appeal, the Appellate Division vacated the

conviction for the criminal possession of weapon on the grounds of insufficient evidence.

THE COURT: How do the defendants wish to proceed?

MR. GOLTZER: We would like an opportunity to review the discovery, submit preliminary budgets to the Court for at least two of the defendants because it is a potentially capital case. Even though the government is not at this time requesting mitigation, it is incumbent upon us, with gentlemen of middle age who have been out of trouble for the most part for, at least Mr. Skinner for 30 years or 25 years, to submit mitigation at some point, if necessary.

So, we would like to put together a team, have a chance to review the discovery, get a decision from the government on the death penalty. We expect we know it is going to be, but we would like to defer a motion schedule until we at least have that decision.

THE COURT: Mr. Chan, what can you tell me about that?

MR. CHAN: Your Honor, all I can really say is that
the capital case process is under way with respect to two of
the three defendants. Mr. Merced is not eligible for the death
penalty because he was 17 years old at the time of the murder.

Defendants Skinner and Brooks are potentially eligible for the
death penalty. I can say that the capital case process is
under way. As the Court is aware, the process can sometimes
take months. At this stage we are not asking for any

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

submissions from the defendants.

THE COURT: Very well.

So, Mr. Goltzer, how long to make sense?

MR. GOLTZER: Well, we were requesting -- and we consulted with your deputy -- for February the -- was it the 12th? I'm sorry.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, February 12th.

MR. GOLTZER: February 12 at 3:30 to give the Court an update of where we are, if that's agreeable.

THE COURT: That's okay with me.

Mr. Chan?

MR. CHAN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. GOLTZER: And we, of course, consent to the exclusion.

THE COURT: Very well.

Is there anything else that we can do today, Mr. Chan?

MR. CHAN: Your Honor, the government would move to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act between today and the date of the next conference on February 12th. Such an exclusion of time is in the interests of justice because it will allow for the defendants to review the discovery that's been produced and to determine what, if any, pretrial motions they wish to file.

THE COURT: No objection?

MR. GOLTZER: None.

JCA5merC conference

MR. DeMARCO: No objection.

MR. MYSLIWIEC: No objection.

THE COURT: Very well.

I will exclude the time between now and February 12th under the Speedy Trial Act. I find that it is in the best interests of the defendant to review the discovery that's been provided by the government and that that interest outweighs the interest of the public in a speedy and public trial. So, that time will be excluded.

Unless there is anything else, we are adjourned.